DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 122 686 HE 007 726

AUTHOR	Zwingle, J. L.
TITLE	Effective Trusteeship. Some Guidelines for New Trustees and Regents.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	34p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 720, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Policy; *Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Bibliographies; *Board of Education Role; Chief Administrators; *Governance; Guidelines; *Higher Education; Management; Post Secondary Education; *Trustees

ABSTRACT

Because of the new emphasis on education and the widely differing views about it, there has been a significant increase in the volume of writings about governing boards for colleges and universities. Reference to some of these will be found in the bibliography for this brief statement, as well as in the text. This document gives trustees and regents suggestions on the special nature of the task and a convenient guide to critical areas of trustee responsibility. Areas covered are: (1) problems in academic trusteeship; (2) ways and means; (3) the future of the academic trusteeship; and (4) variation and addenda. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED122686

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

HE 007724

EFFECTIVE TRUSTEESHIP

Some Guidelines for New Trustees and Regents

J. L. Zwingle

J. L. Zwingle is the past president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. In this essay, *Effective Trusteeship: Some Guidelines for New Trustees and Regents*, he shares some of the wisdom he accumulated in a long career as teacher, administrator and college president, as well as in his ten years' leadership of AGB.

Acknowledgments

To a number of persons in higher education, the author owes a special debt for taking time to read the first draft of this document and for offering a number of valuable suggestions. A treatise designed for such a wide and varied readership is likely to be unsatisfactory: too general, too elementary, too selective.

It is reassuring therefore that these readers have endorsed the document as a whole, while pressing for certain changes in emphasis or in substance. In listing their names, the author does not intend to implicate them in any of the shortcomings which other readers may detect, nor to imply that all their suggestions have been followed.

Stephen K. Bailey
Everett H. Bellows
Lloyd M. Cofer
Sol Luis DesCartes
Lloyd H. Elliott
Nolen M. Ellison
Elmer Jagow
David F. Johnson
James M. Mitchell
Hollis A. Moore
John W. Oswald
John W. Pocock
Ben C. Rusche

© Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1975. Printed in the United States of America

This publication was made possible by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc.

EFFECTIVE TRUSTEESHIP

Some Guidelines for New Trustees and Regents

Until recently, the general public took little interest in academic trusteeship. Suddenly, however, the trustee, new or old, finds himself a subject of considerable public concern. This new public attitude is a by-product of several conditions: the vast expansion of higher education in the past two decades, the campus turmoil of the sixties, and the financial crisis of the seventies – itself a product both of financial inflation and the shrinkage in enrollment. Demands upon the time and energy of trustees have expanded; trusteeship is no longer the rather quiet endeavor of former times.

Because of the new emphasis on education and the widely differing views about it, there has been a significant increase in the volume of writings about governing boards for colleges and universities. Reference to some of these will be found in the bibliography for this brief statement, as well as in the text itself.

The purpose of this document is to give trustees and regents generally, but the newly appointed trustee and regent in particular, a comment on the special nature of the task and a convenient guide to critical areas of trustee responsibility. As a start, let us look briefly at the landscape of higher education.

There are some 3,000 units of higher education, as calculated by the U.S. Office of Education. These units range from small specialized institutions to large multi-campus universities. As between the public and private sectors, enrollment now is found dominantly in public institutions – about 76 percent. Some 34 percent of the total enrollment is found in nearly 1,000 public two-year colleges. The regional colleges and universities (such as Kent State University in Ohio, or Central Michigan University) enroll some 20 percent, leaving 22 percent for the state universities and land-grant institutions, and 24 percent for the entire private sector.

This imbalance in student enrollment, however, is reversed in the deployment of trustees. The estimated total number of trustees ranges upwards of 35,000, not including some 1,000 members of non-governing boards with coordinating powers only. For the senior public colleges and universities the total number of trustees is only about 2,000; and for the public two-year colleges only 4,000. In the private sector, in contrast, the senior colleges have a total of some 25,000, while trustees of the private two-year colleges come to 5,000. One state board has responsibility for a system enrolling over 100,000 students.

Not only is there a considerable range in types of institution and in the size of boards, but there is more diversity among trustees than is commonly supposed. Yet while the concerns of trustees at a large state university may seem to differ greatly from those of the small independent college, the differences are more apparent than real. The difference in scale may require a difference in approach, but the essential problems are more alike than many people are ready to admit.

To the extent that differences do exist, let us recognize and deal with them. But at the outset let us examine a few of the problems faced in common by all trustees/regents.

1. Problems in Academic Trusteeship

One universal problem is the difference in expectations among parties at interest. The first of these is the faculty – the permanent core of the academic enterprise. Students are the second group having special interest – and then come donors, legislators, public officials, parents, alumni, and the press. Each group will have its own definition of good trusteeship and will press its claim. Administrators themselves have expectations of trustees – and vice versa. Each group will feel the heat of controversy and each will lean on the other.

The concept of a governing board as representing the public interest is an idea which can lead to a special kind of misunderstanding. If an individual board member is to represent some special group, the board itself cannot fulfill its responsibility to the whole public. Otherwise we should be forced to establish formal representation for any group which could muster strength to support its claims for special treatment. Students and faculty members are useful as observers and commentators, but as members of the board of their own institution, they are almost certain to be special pleaders.

All these matters must be discussed further, each in turn, but first we should look at the conflicting notions about the essential nature of an academic institution. Without some agreement on that point, an institution becomes just another arena for competing factions.

Among the following concepts, each has its supporters and each has some degree of validity. They are not totally in conflict, though carried to extremes each becomes unacceptable:

The college as a community of students for whose benefit all other groups on campus are organized and who should therefore respond to student interests.

The college as a public agency, to be operated for the public good, responsive to the society of which it is an arm.

The college as a center for vocational or professional training, a source of competent personnel for commerce, industry, government and other social agencies.

The college as a community of scholars.

The college as a business corporation, functioning under an administrator who is responsible to a board.

The college as an agency of the state, supported by the public treasury, subject to the same authority and procedures as other state agencies.

To some extent every institution conforms to each of these ideas, but in differing degree. If an institution is chartered to provide vocational training as its main activity, it should not then be judged as a liberal arts college. Nor should the liberal arts college be confused with a vocational or pre-professional institution. Yet such confusions do arise, and it is becoming increasingly difficult to decide at what point the program of the institution has gone beyond its proper bounds. One criticism of colleges and universities today is that (with the exception of most of the community colleges) there is too much similarity, that all institutions, small and large, are attempting too much both in volume and in variety. As one trustee has put it, there is a need for both horizontal and vertical diversity.

The first duty of the trustee, then, is to understand the purpose of the institution to determine direction, and to assist in holding a steady course. Purposes may change with changing times, but changes are matters for serious deliberation and sober judgment. In days of conflict about education—and educators—trustees have a particular obligation to determine the major policies by which their institution shall be guided. In doing so, they of course will seek the counsel of competent professional educators, beginning with the president of their institution.

The College as a Corporation

The college or university is a corporation, in effect if not in fact. The private institution is established by a charter which vests in a board the responsibility for carrying out the purposes for which the institution was founded. Public institutions are established by legislation, sometimes under constitutional provisions, sometimes not. In any case, the institution is provided with a board which is responsible for the fulfillment of the collegiate program.

But as every trustee should remember, as *individuals, trustees have no legal standing.* The majority vote of the board is the only official basis for action. Individual trustees will have private opinions on many questions, but their personal judgments should be carefully labeled as such and seldom expressed. Much better for the individual trustee to use his time outside board meetings helping people to understand official board actions than joining in the varieties of speculation and vocalization so characteristic of colleges wherever they may be.

The trustee can perform valuable service by listening carefully and being reasonably available to those who wish to register opinions. He can be a source of comfort and support (or correction) for many individuals. But he must always be careful to safeguard against misunderstanding of his role.

The Distinctive Nature of the Academy

An attitude of laymen in general is that there is no significant difference between academic institutions and other organized activities. It is this outlook which has tended to stimulate the suspicions of academic people toward the non-academics who hold power as trustees. Perhaps nothing is more important for the trustee than to perceive the differences and to demonstrate in his work as a board member that these differences are important to trustees as much as to the faculty and administration.

What then are the differences? They lie not so much in structure as in function. Fiscal soundness is not an index of academic vitality. Fiscal realities cannot be avoided, as everyone learns sooner or later. But for the academy, the really important facts are those which *surround* financial data. A valuable paper to read in this connection is "A Comparison of the University with the Corporation," by Ralph Besse,[1] an experienced trustee who is also an attorney and a former business executive, which appeared in *AGB Reports*, and formed one chapter of a volume published for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education under the title, *The University as an Organization*.[2] Two other chapters in this volume compare the university with a government bureau and with a large foundation, and a summary chapter by John J. Corson classifies the differences in five categories: purpose, activities, atmosphere, membership, and internal relationships. Here it may be said that the essence of the special character of colleges and universities is found in two broad relationships within it, the relationship between students and teachers and the relationship between these two and the administration. The quality of these relationships provides the best indicator of the real health of the institution.

Policy vs. Administration

Within this setting the board confronts difficult tasks indeed. Perhaps the most difficult is to distinguish between policy and administration, and to understand levels of policy. In an article on "Institutional Policy and Its Abuses," Bogue and Riggs refer to three levels of policy:

Governing Policy: Those policies of mission and program and general operating conditions set by governing agencies.

Executive Policy: Those policies of fiscal, facility, and personnel management established by the president and the chief executive officers in response to governing policy.

Operating Policy: Those policies of work environment

1. Ralph Beese, "A Comparison of the University with the Corporation," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 15, No. 3 (November/December 197[illegible].

2. James A. Perkins, ed., **The University as an Organization,** Report to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

and expectation set by deans and directors of activities in response to executive policies.[3]

The authors add that "the general function of policy in organization is simple in intent. Policy effectiveness, however, is complicated by its frequent abuse" – by which they mean the misuse of policy to protect status, or as a substitute for administrative courage or good judgment, or to cover exceptions. It is a thoughtful essay, worthy of close study by any trustee.

Charles A. Nelson puts the matter neatly:

> The art of trusteeship consists largely of discovering and holding the middle ground of policy-making, eschewing with equal vigor the posture of mere validation on the one hand and the usurpation of administration on the other.[4]

Stephen K. Bailey, vice president of the American Council on Education, in conversation with the author, has stated his view of the matter thus: As a trustee, the test question in separating policy from administration is whether a proposed action will change the nature or direction of the institution or its subordinate structure. If it will, the board should recognize the implications for long-term policy before casting the vote.

The Role of the Governing Board

Trustees have been known to complain about operating under such limitations that decisions are virtually fixed before being brought to the board. Such complaints may be valid, but when valid they represent a failure on the part of the board or of the administration – or both – to reach a sound agreement about their respective roles and to establish simple, clear procedures in support of their roles.

In a number of publications over the past 30 years the role and scope of trusteeship have been analyzed from different points of view, but the discussions are usually organized in about the same fashion from author to author. A valuable analysis was produced by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education *(The Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems)*.[5] There the role of the board is summarized this way:

- To hold and interpret the trust
- To act as a buffer
- To arbitrate internal disputes
- To stimulate change
- To be responsible for financial welfare of the campus
- To provide for governance

Of these, only the fourth is likely to produce controversy. The concept of the board as stimulator of change runs counter to the claims of administration, faculty, and

3. E. G. Bogue and R. O. Riggs, "Institutional Policy and Its Abuses," **Journal of Higher Education,** Vol. 45, No. 5 (May 1974).

4. Charles A. Nelson, "The Lay Trustee – Up or Out?" **AGB Reports,** Vol. 14, No. 7 (April 1972).

5. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, **The Governance of Higher Education** (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

students. Each group, alone or in combination with the others, is likely to feel a special competence to deal with needs for change and each is likely to argue that the lay governing board is not competent to stimulate the right kind of changes – being, they think, not only lacking in educational insights, but also subject to outside pressures.

Dr. Clark Kerr, former chairman of the Carnegie Commission, and now chairman of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies, has an opposing point of view. He and others contend that the lay board alone is sufficiently disengaged from self-interest in academic issues to exercise the tempered judgment required for the long-term stability, vitality and flexibility of the colleges.[6]

6. "Conversation with Clark Kerr," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 15, No. 9 (July/August 1973).

Trustee Tasks

Further, Dr. Kerr has compiled a list of obligations now confronting trustees:

1. To study their own membership. To develop a board of fully independent and devoted members who are sensitive to but not committed to the views of the several major constituencies that relate to the institution.

2. To protect the essential independence of their institution from external control.

3. To review periodically the purposes of their institution.

4. To assure the forward motion of their institution as against the current "survivalist" mentality of so many within the academic community. This includes the selection of active presidents.

5. To manage their resources effectively.

6. To anticipate levels and nature of future enrollments and plan adjustments in advance. This includes potential adjustments in faculty composition: tenure and non-tenure, and participation of women and members of minority groups.

7. To be cognizant of the new mentalities developing among faculty members and students: new attitudes, new motivations and interests, new styles of life. To be "in touch."

8. To assure a voice for trustees at the state and federal levels when matters of common concern are under discussion, such as tax policy on gifts and policies on controls over higher education.

Dr. Kerr's list was constructed with a view to the current state of affairs. Dr. Ben Rusche, a physicist serving on the board of Furman University, suggests adding another emphasis, the importance of planning for the future as a constant responsibility of trustees, that is, the regular review of contingencies and the development of optional strategies for the institution.

Special attention should be drawn to the very first sentence of Dr. Kerr's first point, a novel thought when it was originally voiced at the AGB fall conference in 1973: "To study their own membership." Trustees continue to neglect this task, to their own harm and that of their institution. Rare indeed is the board which has adopted a program of scrutiny to determine whether the board is well-balanced and especially qualified to serve its own particular institution. By the process of accreditation, the institution itself undergoes periodic examination, and the process of accreditation frequently involves a comment on board performance. But seldom does this report provide the force for change that it does for the academic and administrative parts of the institution.

We began by observing the range of expectations confronting the trustees. But how shall the trustee decide whose expectations he should attempt to satisfy? The answer to this question is both simple and complex. It is simple in the sense that the trustee has only one basic obligation: to exercise judgment on issues of policy without undue regard for pressures or opinions to the contrary; and the trustee must then do whatever possible as a member of the corporation to see that decisions are in fact carried out.

The trustee then must choose a set of attitudes toward the task. Over-activity will become self-defeating. Passivity will be unproductive. To attempt to know everything about the institution will be foolish, but to know too little is to be helpless.

To become a productive member of the corporation, the trustee must take time to understand the purposes of the institution, to develop a vision of its future potentialities, to relate effectively to the other trustees and the administration – not to say other elements of the total community, on campus and off. In the course of time, it becomes possible to help create the most important single factor in institutional success, the spirit of the corporate body – meaning first the board, but also and ultimately all those who are involved and who are committed to high expectations and realistic goals for the institution. An institution in which the major components are divided and in conflict is a crippled institution. The one in which there is spirited controversy but basic commitment is a healthy institution.

Good health should begin with a good board. A strong president may compensate for a poor board, but eventually that president will be gone. Then the cost of weakness in the board will appear, and a high cost it may turn out to be. A strong faculty may compensate for weakness in both administration and board, but a strong faculty is not likely to hold its strength if not matched in fair degree by administration or board, preferably both. Weakness in any of these major components will eventually affect every aspect of institutional life, beginning with disaffection of students and ending with loss of public support.

Pitfalls

We have already mentioned these individually, but to summarize: There are three major pitfalls in the way of the conscientious trustee.

1. Failure to understand the nature of the board.
2. Failure to understand the distinctive nature of academic institutions.
3. Failure to distinguish between broad policy and the administrative function.

They need emphasis because even the most experienced and highly placed trustees have been known to violate one or two or even all three of these cardinal guidelines. Board chairmen, committee chairmen and others in responsible positions as board members have overlooked the limitations on individual action by trustees and have placed themselves and their institution in awkward, sometimes vulnerable, positions. Every trustee should understand, too, the difference between participating in a board decision by casting a vote and serving as an advisor when called upon or on his own initiative.

The Nature of the Trust

The trustee of an estate is responsible for conserving fiscal assets. By the same token, trustees and regents of universities and colleges are assumed to have first, perhaps exclusive, concern with fiscal affairs. If the business side of the institution appears to be sound, what then should concern the trustee? Obviously he should be concerned with the educational program. But then how shall he avoid meddling in matters where is not expert?

Discussion of this troublesome area will be found in the second section of this commentary, but for the moment it is important to acknowledge that the trustee/regent in higher education is responsible for a *process* as well as for *property*, for *activities* as well as for *assets*. It is a sobering thought. How shall the trustee live up to the obligation? The question is especially vexing when one stops to realize that there has never been wide agreement on either the content or the methods of education. But the trustee must begin by accepting the function of the institution as his concern, along with the fiscal operation. In fact, the fiscal operation cannot make sense apart from the educational function, including goals, experimentation and those controversies which seem inherent in the academic enterprise.

Three Essentials

To grapple with this range of responsibilities, the board needs to concentrate on three special functions as they

bear on the total institution. First is the *planning function.* The board should not be the planning body, but rather the source of demand for adequate planning for all aspects of the institution. The function of planning is never static, never finished, but must remain in a state of continuous revision as experience dictates.

Given competent planning, the board can perform its next function, that of *authorization,* the meaning of which is self-evident. The third stage is *review.* Planning, authorization, review - these abstract words, obvious in meaning, hardly open to debate, must each be applied to specific aspects of the institution: enrollment, finance, public relations, procurement, the whole range of support activities which will make or break the institution -- make it if consistently carried out and break it if left unattended or unrelated each to the other.

With this seemingly universal task, how shall the board approach the job?

II. Ways and Means

It is one thing to generalize about good organization and good practice but quite another to produce the results. Advice and exhortation are not enough. The magic ingredient is people. Procedures are no substitute for people. Procedures and bylaws can help (or hinder) those who are both able and willing to perform, and may protect an institution from the whims of the wrongheaded and from the sometimes whimsical behavior of well-intentioned but uninformed persons. But a discussion of organization must begin with the assumption that the board and administration are enlightened, energetic, and committed to their joint task. If the board or administration is weak or misguided, the problem becomes one of reform rather than of organization. In discussing organization, therefore, provisions for reform must be included. It is a matter of history that strong institutions sometimes fall into disrepair, that weak institutions become strong. Most institutions, however, tend to maintain a fairly steady state until and unless circumstances force a radical change for better or worse. Rare indeed is the institution where foresight has determined a course of action.

A question which hangs over the entire field of lay trusteeship is whether lay governing boards can provide the central policy function attributed to them or whether they will become subordinated to mere ceremonial roles. In the public sector, the issue is institutional independence. In the private sector, the issue is survival.

In both sectors boards are the target of certain criticisms -- that the average age is too high, that the members are from the same mold, that they are disengaged, indifferent, uninformed, passive; that they are guilty of conflict of interest; that they act in secret and are arbi-

trary in judgment. In the attempt to meet these criticisms, actions have been taken which have complicated the function of the board in new ways – "the sunshine laws," i.e., board meetings open to the public; over-representation of special constituencies, the tendency of trustees to become managers, and so on. . . . Amidst such cross-currents, only a mature group wisdom can maintain the integrity and continuity so important to institutions.

Before discussing organization of the board, we should note that board members, like everyone else, have individual personalities. Variety in personality types is especially valuable, provided reasonable balance is maintained. Again we are indebted to Stephen Bailey for an observation on the types of persons needed to provide both variety and balance in trusteeship. Bailey lists four types: *the gadfly, the restrainer, the mediator,* and *the philosopher.* The gadfly (one per board may be enough), wants action now, though he sometimes is not greatly concerned about substance. The restrainer calls for deliberation. The mediator helps the other two find a middle ground; and the philosopher asks for some thought about the implications and long-range consequences. Happy is the president whose board contains just the right mixture of these types.

The Organization of the Board

Membership. As between public and private boards, with variation in size and method of selection makes necessary separate comments on each. In the public sector, the size of the board is determined by legislation. Changes usually result from consolidations rather than otherwise – though occasionally new boards are created to assume functions formerly assigned elsewhere. The range in function and responsibility among the public boards is striking. In a single state, there may be a board of twelve members responsible for a multi-campus university enrolling perhaps 40,000 students, with plant, staff, and budget to match. The so-called regional colleges and universities in that state may have separate boards of twelve persons – or may be grouped under one board for that special type of institution. The state's community colleges may have separate boards of twelve members each. Thus perhaps ten community colleges may have local boards with a total membership of more than 100, while the state university and the regional institutions together may have only some two dozen regents. Yet at the same time, that state may have a coordinating board of some twelve or fifteen members who have statutory concern for the total program of higher education.

Even apart from the issue of optimum board size, there is room for question about the selection and deployment

of citizens responsible for the totality of higher education. The answers to such questions depend primarily on a point of conviction, whether membership on governing boards is worthy of as much care in recruitment as would be expected in the selection of, for example, a member of the state supreme court. Granted that a volunteer cannot be expected to meet professional criteria, it is not unreasonable to expect of regents and trustees the highest degree of experience and probity. There are outstanding examples of high quality in boards of regents. The system as it now operates, however, does not assure protection against the dominance of political factors in the selection of regents. Nor is there evidence of efforts toward strengthening the citizen's role in formulating institutional goals. At the same time, especially among newer institutions, there is need for *more statesmanship and less intervention in institutional affairs* on the part of regents.[7]

In the private sector, with relatively few restrictions on the selection of board members, there is nevertheless great variation in board size—and quality. Here the possibilities are open for improvement both in organization and role, given a willingness to deal with the issue. But among the private institutions board meetings tend to be fewer, the agendas more stereotyped, and the role of the trustee too passive.

Generally speaking, in both the public and private sectors, the tendency among boards is to concentrate on the performance of the president, on the financial health of the institution and on the level of public approval. Put another way, the absence of crisis is taken to indicate good health.

Deployment. The question next arises, how best should a board be organized to serve its purposes? How many committees? How many meetings? What sort of agenda?

Starting with the fact that a board is legally and morally responsible for the long-term welfare of the institution, the board has no limit on the range and depth of its concerns. But the board cannot succeed if it tries to do everything. It therefore must depend on the president and the staff for recommendations. It is no service to the president, however, simply to adopt recommendations without scrutiny and discussion, and without expenditure of time before formal meetings to assure an adequate grasp of issues. Thus committee work becomes urgently important.

How many committees? The best answer is the minimum necessary to get the job done. Depending on the size of the board, and the importance of involving every member in some aspect of committee work, the number of committees will still depend on objectives—work to be done. Non-functioning committees are probably worse than plain under-involvement.

On the subject of standing committees, there is considerable agreement that the fewer the better. In a letter to

7. Earl F. Cheit, "Regent Watching," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 13, No. 6 (March 1971)

the author, President John W. Oswald of The Pennsylvania State University takes a strong stand against executive committees in particular:

You mention an executive committee as apparently an important part of a board. This is not the case on many boards. Indeed, many boards have run into great problems over executive committees which have essentially taken the authority over in such a way as to make the rest of the trustees either angry or disinterested. It is my judgment, having dealt with three boards, that an executive committee is a minus rather than a plus. I do recognize that for a private institution having 50-60 trustees an executive committee is necessary; but in those cases I have often wondered why the institutions didn't call the executive committee the governing board and identify the rest as a board of visitors or some other name.

Even so, most boards do rely on an executive committee for convenience and timeliness – perhaps too much so.

President Hollis Moore of Bowling Green State University is opposed to standing committees altogether. He fears that standing committees tend to become administrative in effect, making decisions rather than formulating recommendations. Where such tendencies have in fact developed, correction is not easy. In the smaller boards serving state-related institutions, it is commonplace for the board to act as a whole. In such cases, however, the agenda itself becomes a serious problem. It is the author's view that virtually every board serving state-related institutions urgently needs the benefit of supplementary groups serving as advisory committees in various areas of academic and public affairs.

Almost any board could settle for four standing committees: an executive committee, a nominating committee, a committee on educational affairs, and a committee on finance and audit.

In addition, however, ad hoc committees should be appointed in accordance with the needs of the institution. These needs will be determined by the current priorities demanding attention. Board committees can be expanded to include representation of various special interest groups or to include individuals of special competence to assist with a problem or project. By this means students, faculty, alumni, government officials, and others can be brought into the councils of the institution without tinkering with the authorized structure and without encumbering the institution with an overburden of persons with vested interest in the decision.

Memberships on such committees should have clear terminal dates. An ad hoc committee should have a categorical assignment and a specific life span. The wise use of such committees will make possible wide consultation and involvement without freezing the institution into an organizational mold. The object is the "developmental outlook" earlier mentioned, the marshalling of human

resources. This approach is open to every type of institution, public or private, small or large.

Needed: Two Kinds of Audit

But beware. . . . Unless some minimal funds and staff time are made available to ad hoc committees, they will almost certainly not produce. There is an inescapable connection between the quality of volunteer services and the adequacy of staff allocation. America is a country justly proud of its tradition of volunteer activity, but the efficient application of volunteer efforts remains in a primitive stage. All eleemosynary institutions – hospitals, museums, galleries, churches – represent the achievement of some voluntary effort. Yet the typical history shows that after the first efforts to establish a going concern, a period of slack sets in. Thereafter institutions tend not to develop organically, so to speak, but to lurch and lunge, to rise and subside, to waken for a space and then slumber.

Therefore one must conclude that institutions need two kinds of audit, one conventional, the other not. The financial audit is understood. What is not well understood is that the financial audit may be misleading, or at least inadequate. The requirement for such an audit in three-year periods might be a worthy inclusion to the bylaws (which shall be discussed next). Whereas the accrediting bodies give a periodic audit of the academic quality of an institution, only the governing board can invite an audit of itself and the total health of the institution. Such an effort would call for an unusually open attitude among the trustees and administration. It would involve an unusual array of talents on the part of the auditor or auditors. But surely it can be done. The Manual of Operations could serve as an audit guide or checklist. Hindsight tells us how institutions might have avoided the trauma of many a bad experience. Perhaps better foresight might avoid others. *Such an effort depends almost solely on the board.* Disengaged from the daily demands of operations and the daily pressures of individuals and groups, the board is in position to press for priorities, both short-term and long-term. Together with the president, the board has a concern for the total institution. If the board fails in this fundamental duty, everything else will suffer.

Bylaws as a Chart for Organization

There are those who hold bylaws in such high esteem they wish to use them to record every function of every department and subdepartment of the institution. But the more detailed the bylaws the more often they will need revision – and this is not an easy thing to do. Despite the standard provisions for change, some kind of

mind-set makes for difficulty in revising bylaws, which are but a supplement to the charter, specifying what may not be declared in the charter allocating responsibilities for the work of the board.

Thus, the simpler the bylaws, the less probability of obsolescence, the more flexibility for board and administration – provided the bylaws require the president and the chairman of the board each year to record the current plan of organization of the college and the board. It may be surprising to some persons that bylaws are not usually even a legal necessity, though in case of litigation the courts may require some official document allocating duties among trustees and officers of the institution.

Hence, there are relatively few points required for inclusion in bylaws, provided the board and administration adopt a statement of duties from time to time indicating the current state of organization. The bare necessities for bylaws are offered in Section IV of this paper.

The Board Meeting

In one sense, the board of trustees/regents can be said to exist only during the time of meeting. During that time, full authority and responsibility rest upon the group. Actions taken become a part of the record of the institution, a part that can be changed only by later actions of the board. Between meetings, individual trustees have other opportunities to serve the institution, a topic for a later section.

The meeting itself can be short, yet constructive; or short and perfunctory; or long, tedious, and disruptive; or long, systematic, and regenerative. The meeting is but a means to an end. A meeting which yields personal satisfaction to those present may be a good thing, but not if that is its principal accomplishment.

A recent study of board performance in 19 state-related colleges over a ten-year period conducted by James Gilbert Paltridge confirmed some long-standing suspicions: 1) that much meeting time was consumed in matters that could have been handled otherwise; and 2) that over a period of ten years there had been no major change in board concerns.[8]

Industrial boards of directors come under fire from time to time because they are dominated by insiders or by persons from other corporations sharing the same interests and outlook. Academic boards, on the other hand, are criticized for domination by outsiders who do not understand the substance of the enterprise. In both cases the board is in danger of being an echo chamber instead of a forum for the airing of ideas in the decision-making, policy-setting process. Perhaps some of the "forum" aspect of board work should take place before the board meeting; the important thing is full disclosure and ample exchange of points of view.

8. James Gilbert Paltridge, "Folklore and Some Facts About Trusteeship," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 16, No. 5 (March 1974). Adapted from Paltridge, et al, **Boards of Trustees: Their Decision Patterns** (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California/ Berkeley, 1973).

It is safe to say that most board meetings stand in need of improvement. Rare is the report of satisfaction with the typical board meeting. Granted that some member or other will always be less than happy over a particular meeting, it is still possible to conduct board meetings in such a way as to provide not only satisfaction for the members but, more important, creativity for the institution. Bringing about the necessary change depends on a chairman and a president who are willing to act.

The Agenda

The agenda of most board meetings is either too full or too random. There are usually three types of material to be covered: 1) validation of actions taken by the administration or by the executive committee; 2) information about principal activities within the institution, consisting of reports from officers and committees; and 3) authorization of new actions recommended by officers or committees. If these routine matters can be handled expeditiously, a valuable fourth item can be added: discussion of current policy concerns – enrollment, finance, student and faculty demeanor, or public relations.

Paltridge's study, though limited to state-related institutions, confirms the experience and observations of many people throughout every type of institution: that too much board time is spent on detail or trivia, that discussion tends to become disproportionate to the importance of the issue or to the time available. A board made up of unpaid volunteers meeting infrequently has built-in problems of discipline; it is not easy for its members to keep informed, yet operational discipline and shared information are indispensable to board efficiency.

It is certainly possible to organize a board meeting so that time can be allocated according to the importance or urgency of a matter (a matter can be urgent without being terribly important). If the executive committee has substituted itself for the board, as sometimes happens, the board meeting may be taken up entirely with a report and validation of the various actions of the executive committee. If on the contrary the executive committee has left something important for the board to do, time may be economized by designating one or two members to study the actions of the executive committee and of the administration, summarize them and offer a motion of validation. Thus the time of the board will be saved for major items of current importance. At least items for validation can be separated, reserving for discussion those matters that require it.

An agenda can be organized to reflect the degree of policy implication for various types of action, so that the board can readily see where major attention should be directed. To convey a sense of continuity, the board would profit from the use of an annual forecast of topics to be discussed at future meetings. While each agenda

cannot be detailed far in advance, major topics can be identified.

A simple visual aid can be of great help to a board, yet very few maintain a flow chart or other graphic representation of actions previously taken. Such an aid can provide many benefits. It can, as has been mentioned earlier, function as a *review*. Many boards have unwittingly taken actions which contravene actions taken in a previous meeting. A chart can help provide the basis for "status and outlook" reports on actions previously authorized.

In the press of immediate considerations, boards sometimes overlook matters that only need periodic review. The curriculum, the college year and calendar, proportions of resident and commuting students, leaves and vacations, sabbaticals, appointment procedures, disciplinary and parietal rules, and a hundred other matters fall mainly within the competence of the administration and faculty, but from time to time need policy re-statement by the board. To insure their not being overlooked, it is good practice for a board to compose a checklist. This checklist may be included in a handbook or manual incorporating the bylaws, adopted policy statements, and other materials useful for reference by both new and experienced board members.

The substance of the matter rests on a few clear points. The dynamics of board meetings will largely be determined by the competence of the chairman and the president, their close cooperation, and their willingness to make sure that board members are energized rather than bored or distracted by the meeting. None of this is possible if the institution has not set itself on a sound course of short-term and long-term planning to which everything can be related.

Essentially, the volunteer board member will find a reward in the sense of participating in work which outreaches one life span, contributes to the advancement of human beings individually and at large, and maintains a vital function for the benefit of society. Otherwise, board service becomes just another ego trip.

Between Meetings

When the board meeting adjourns, the board member may have been assigned duty on either a standing committee or an ad hoc committee; or the member may be without assignment. In either case, between meetings the member has a duty. It is to maintain a lively interest in the institution, to broaden his understanding of educational issues, and to expose the mind to basic relevant information which will improve his grasp and increase his sense of proportion.

If a board member's attention is concentrated on the college only at meeting time, the results cannot be good. If the institution is secondary to many other competing

interests, the results cannot be good. Those who accept board membership should place it in rank immediately after personal and occupational demands. And few people have the time or capacity to deal with more than two or three high-ranking commitments to volunteer undertakings.

Trusteeship, like all important undertakings, is an art to be cultivated rather than a technique to be learned. It is a wise person whose self-understanding leads to good performance of the right role as a member of a board.

Apart from his official duties, a board member has much opportunity to help the institution. But he should bear in mind three provisos:

First, that any informal service he undertakes is reasonably coordinated with other efforts in the same area of interest.

Second, that the informal activity is authorized by somebody and reported from time to time. The authorization can be either by the board or by the president—or his agent—but should not be operated ad lib. Otherwise, the result may take the form of frustration, misdirection, friction and disaffection.

Third, that the board member not engage in professional practice for the college, either by contract or as a volunteer. The architect, lawyer, insurance agent, engineer should have valuable judgment to offer; but for the college to rely on either paid or volunteer services from board members not only involves a conflict of interest but usually spells distress for the institution. Building committees should not design or redesign buildings, though they can recommend acceptance or rejection of designs.

Lawyers in particular would do well to heed the words of a distinguished commentator, experienced in the world of trusteeship. Nils Y. Wessell, in an address to an AGB conference, referred to the "stickler" as one type of trustee who impedes the work for the board. Coining the word "doicot" for "the dotter of i's and the crosser of t's," Wessell states that most of the doicots in his experience were lawyers.[9]

The learned professions in general tend toward the technical approach to problems, and by training lawyers are the most inclined that way. Of course there are outstanding exceptions, exemplified by such persons as Laird Bell (Chicago lawyer, and trustee of the University of Chicago and of Carleton College), a long time leader among trustees, and others still active.

With these caveats in mind, informal services in fundraising, public relations, student recruitment, trouble shooting, can be invaluable. Judgment, coordination, style: these are the keys. Rightly done, informal activity between meetings may be more important than anything else. It is an individual role, except for committee work. And it should make for better trusteeship.

9. Nils Y. Wessell, "Board-President Relationships: Second Thoughts," **AGB Reports,** Vol. 16, No. 4 (January 1974).

The Board and the President

According to a well-worn, simplistic and incorrect view, the academic president is the counterpart of any other chief executive—the manager of the enterprise, the agent of the board, serving at the pleasure of the board. For success, he is rewarded; for failure, he is discharged. Thus the agenda of the board may be said to consist basically of one item: affirming confidence in the president.

True, the president is the key figure; but his task is essentially different from that of other corporate executives. It is more comparable to a political role than to corporate administration. This view is finding more and more acceptance, but it needs wider understanding.

Given the peculiar nature of the academic institution, the president is constantly in danger of becoming everybody's target, to be trapped in an adversary position with every group—faculty, students, alumni, donors, even with his own trustees. He is of course primarily the agent of the board. As such, however, his success depends on maintaining constructive relationships with all groups, even when he must oppose one or more of them (including the board itself).

Presidents must be both leaders and managers, but any one person may be better in one role than in the other. Therefore the board needs to make sure that both needs are met in the total staffing of the central administration. The board should not abdicate responsibility for this delicate matter, leaving it all to the president. That is to say, the relationship between board and president should be such that at least some members of the board, beginning with the chairman, can effectively review with the president all matters affecting the forward movement of the institution without invading presidential functions.

The most important functions of the president are to conceptualize, persuade, and mediate. In these respects, the board is the first and last means of cohesion.

Except for unusual situations, the president should be the spokesman for the institution. To the extent that spokesmanship for the board is needed, it would be well for the president and the chairman to reach an understanding. To the extent that the chairman as spokesman does not appear to invade the functions of administration, the chairman can serve a good purpose as spokesman for the board—giving visibility to the board itself and serving as a buffer for the president.

Evaluating the President

Today the evaluation of presidents is becoming a matter of increased interest. It is important that efforts to

evaluate be reasonable and realistic. Just as board members cannot embody all the virtues, neither can presidents. There are two clear but elusive standards for evaluation of presidents: 1) whether the office is being conducted according to understandings reached at the time of appointment; 2) whether on balance the institution is maintaining vitality. Board members should remember that in evaluating a president, the board is also evaluating itself, both as to judgment in the original appointment, and as to its own performance during the tenure of the president. In any case, the evaluation of a president probably needs the assistance of a competent outsider or an outside committee, that can assure a degree of objectivity and perhaps some mediation of differences.

On the use of an outsider and on the purposes of evaluation the author has encountered some serious questions. Naturally, the usefulness of the outsider depends on two factors – the condition of the board and the competence of the outsider. In a matter as delicate as presidential evaluation or board evaluation, self-study tends to become either self-fulfilling or self-defeating. Evaluation itself can be and often is used for devious purposes. Assuming honesty of intent, however, it is still very hard for any group to be objective, thorough and accurate about its own affairs.

To the extent that executive evaluation has progressed as a science, experience from industry can be utilized.

When all the processes of evaluation have been completed, however, it still remains a matter for board decision whether it chooses to stand with a president and support his work. Sometimes the decision on support is difficult, for example when the president is engaged in conflict with the faculty, as in the recent case of a professional school faculty that voted a resolution of no confidence in their dean. The president backed the dean; the board met, considered the case, and backed the president.

The Board and the Faculty

The academic institution has one primary function, the education of students. The functions of research and public service are accepted but secondary. In education, certain exceptionally strong teachers will play an important role. But even more important is the mood and style of the total faculty – especially those holding tenure. While the president is the agent of the board, he should also be seen as an effective leader of the faculty and a spokesman for their concerns. Since the board is in most institutions an absentee group, and since there is natural curiosity, even distrust, of the absentee who is also a lay person, it is wise for the president to arrange for periodic meetings of representatives of both faculty and the board. It is a test of confidence on all sides when such an ar-

rangement is acceptable, but it should not become routine practice.

In such sessions, it is absolutely necessary that the board members understand the boundaries of discretion. The objective should be the opportunity for expression of faculty views. If beforehand it is clear that a board position needs expression, for whatever reason, the president and the board should understand what is to be said by whom. Otherwise, confusion will be worse confounded. In any case, the important thing is the welfare of the total institution, not the pacification of one element.

Should board members converse privately with faculty members? Since as a practical matter it is bound to happen, the real question is whether every board member knows how to avoid a seeming commitment. Unless a board member has been delegated to talk privately with a member of the faculty, for special reasons, he can actually only listen. If the board member should offer an opinion, it will almost certainly be accepted as official, no matter what the disclaimers.

The foregoing statement may seem too restrictive. Certainly board members as individuals can be very useful to individual faculty members when both are dealing with common professional or personal interests. In that sense, there is no limit to the amount of exchange which might prove beneficial. Of greatest importance is the preservation of the distinction between official representations and unofficial and personal exchanges. Easy for some, impossible for others.

The Board and the Students

Important as the faculty certainly must be in any academic situation, the student can hardly be put in second place. The student after all is the first reason for everything, and there have been abuses in the past of student rights. Yet the student cannot be crowned king.

Injustices should be corrected. Boards and administrators should provide for due process. The conviction that a system of justice prevails will do much for the stability and vitality of an institution. But absorption with issues of "student rights" almost certainly means diversion from the main task. Even due process is not in itself a creative factor. Like vaccination or vitamins, due process meets a special need. But it does not create good students, teachers or administrators.

Faculty and Student Board Membership

Recently there has been much talk of student and faculty participation on boards. As we have stated earlier, the concept of the board as representing constituencies within the college or university community is injuri-

ous to the health of a governing board. Yet there is a pronounced trend, particularly among public institutions, toward placing faculty members and students, with full voting privileges, on boards.

There seem to be two basic errors here: first, that faculty members are qualified to speak for the faculty as a whole, whereas in fact they are typically concerned more with their own field of specialization. To avail itself of faculty wisdom, the board can develop devices such as a faculty relations committee. A faculty-trustee may serve as a symbol of participation, but not in substance. Conflict of interest problems arise when faculty members vote on institutional finances. Other problems can also arise from faculty participation in board/president discussions that must be treated confidentially.

The second basic error lies in the perception of students as residents of a sort of municipality with inherent right of self-government. The institution exists primarily for the students, but in quite specific terms – for their education. Educational consequence should determine all matters affecting students. Student participation in institutional matters is not immune from this consideration. How much can the student's education benefit from participation, and to how many students can this benefit be extended?

It may well be that students can offer useful opinions, but it does not follow that either the board or the student will necessarily benefit from membership on the board. The same basic objections made to faculty membership – conflict of interest, divergence of interests among the group themselves, and destructive impact on confidential discussions – also apply to student membership. As in the case of the faculty, common sense must search for the solution to student participation by finding a device by which student opinion can be sought and heard when the board wants it and when the students want to give it.

The Board and the Public

In both the public and private sectors, academic institutions serve a largely public function. They are agents of society in providing the continuity of knowledge and tradition, the development of skills, and the creation of new knowledge. In all these functions, the public well-being is at stake. And in one way or another, some element of the public will be offended by something being done in an institution.

What then should be the role of the board in maintaining public support and good will? Variations here are obvious as between different types of institutions. Community colleges maintain strong ties with the public through open meetings at times and places convenient to the constituency. At least one community college board schedules meetings in different centers of its suburban (Chicago) community for the express purpose of main-

taining communications. For many public institutions on the other hand, "sunshine laws" have constituted a problem by inhibiting discussion of sensitive issues. The zeal of the media for conflict is a constant problem, but so is public apathy or failure to understand.

Some public boards have been known to retain public-relations officers to assist their board chairmen. Wrong. If the president and the board do not form a cohesive unit with the president as the chief spokesman, something is askew.

Nevertheless, it is true that the president and chairman should develop a system whereby board actions receive proper public notice, so that the role and function of the board are made clear to the public. This is not a question of social or ceremonial type of publicity. There are occasions when the board needs to be spotlighted, when the institution is adopting a new direction or otherwise making some significant policy change. The occasion must be a matter of judgment by president and board.

III. Academic Trusteeship: Does It Have a Future?

The demise of lay governance has long been predicted and, by some, devoutly hoped for. Complaints against the system are often well founded. Yet so far no reasonable alternative has been offered. Comparisons of the American system with other national systems do not illuminate the landscape very well. In educational affairs, dissatisfaction is common to every system. Yet on balance it does appear that the American approach has been more productive than has any other. Whether that productivity can be attributed mainly to lay governance or to the American commitment to education is open to debate. It does seem clear that governmental domination tends toward rigidity. And at the very least it appears that a plurality of systems is to be preferred over a massive single-structure system. There are certain distinctive problems yet to be resolved for the three major components of the public system in America; that is, for the multi-campus system, for the single-campus institution, and for the two-year community college. In the same way, the problems of the private sector can be seen as distinctive for the major universities, for the non-sectarian college, and for the church-related institution.

Present circumstances are confusing. Some private institutions, small and large, appear to be thriving, both in enrollment and support. Others not so.

Yet the issues were never more important nor the stakes higher than at present. To the extent that citizen participation remains central to American institutions, as certainly it should, the opportunity for trustees and regents is at peak.

One of the virtues attributed to lay governance is that

it provides a safeguard against wide swings in program as the mood shifts in government, or in industry, or among the public. It has been suggested that during the time of Hitler the German universities would have been better served had they been based on lay governance rather than on purely governmental support and policy determination. One would certainly hope so. But to assume so one must also assume a different history for Germanic institutions and for the German people as a whole. That is a puzzle yet to be solved.

In our own country, examples of extreme swings in the public mood are not hard to find, nor is it hard to find examples of administrators who have fallen before the pressures of a bad turn in public attitude. True, many of these victims have been later hailed as exemplars of leadership, post mortem so to speak.

Whatever its shortcomings, we continue to struggle with representative government, holding to a belief in the role of the citizen. The questions and issues now pressing upon the nation are new both in kind and in degree. To the extent that institutions of learning can fulfill their promise, they deserve the support and substantive involvement of people outside the academic profession.

For a more detailed discussion of these large issues, the reader should turn to a special study commissioned by the Association of Governing Boards, *The Future of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards*, by John W. Nason. This was an undertaking the present author had the privilege of initiating and in which he takes understandable satisfaction.

Just now, let us turn to the supplementary listing of resources for the trustee who desires more background for his interesting and rewarding task.

IV. Variations and Addenda

In this final section are included a number of items which may be useful to different boards and individuals in different ways: a checklist of suggested items to be covered in the bylaws; a quiz for trustees; and a basic trusteeship bibliography, annotated and divided into institutional categories and issues.

Bylaws: Some Suggestions

- Election of members—self-perpetuating or appointed; nomination and election procedure; terms of office; filling vacancies
- Officers of board—appointed, ex officio, elected; nomination and election procedure; committee memberships; terms of office
- Meetings—time and place; notice; quorum; the annual meeting; attendance requirement
- Committees—(executive, facilities, development, auditing,

investment, academic policy, others); time and place of meetings; notice; quorum; selection of members
- Powers of committees – policy formulation; reports to full board
- Powers of president and other officials appointed or elected by board
- Procedure for communication between president and board; with other officials
- Requirements for reports of president and other officials
- Expenses of board members – limits; payment procedure
- Conflict of interest – definition; prohibitions
- Amendment to bylaws – procedure

A Quiz for Trustees

This questionnaire was created for the use of the board of trustees of a well-known liberal arts college. Its queries are widely applicable to trustees of the different types of institution. A new trustee might read it early in his tenure and review it again later with others on the board.

	Agree	Disagree
1. There is general consensus regarding the purpose or purposes for which the college exists.	( )	( )
2. It is a responsibility of the trustees to review, and if necessary to redefine, that purpose:	( ) every year ( ) every second year ( ) every third year	( )
3. It is a responsibility of the trustees to make certain that the program and operations of the college are designed to achieve the college's purposes.	( )	( )
4. For the sake of good management trustees ought to rely entirely on the president for their information about the college.	( )	( )
5. Recent discussions about college matters with faculty have been helpful to you as a trustee.	( )	( )
6. Recent discussions about college matters with students have been helpful to you as a trustee.	( )	( )
7. At this institution the distinction between policy and administration is not clearly drawn.	( )	( )
8. We do an adequate job of orienting new trustees to their responsibilities	( )	( )
9. Our trustees receive all the information they need and ought to have in order to fulfill their responsibilities to the college.	( )	( )
10. Board agenda are so arranged that trustees debate important issues rather than matters of detail.	( )	( )
11. Board meetings are long enough to permit adequate discussion of major policy matters.	( )	( )
12. Three meetings of the board per year are adequate for discussion of all necessary matters.	( )	( )
13. The present committee structure of the board is entirely satisfactory.	( )	( )
14. The authority and effectiveness of the board and of committees would be strengthened by meeting regularly with representatives of faculty and/or students.	( )	( )
15. The authority and effectiveness of the board would be strengthened by opening all meetings to faculty, students and employees.	( )	( )
16. The present diversity within our board – by age, sex, ethnic background, occupation and interest – is satisfactory.	( )	( )
17. The board should take time to assess and "grade" its own performance.	( ) every year ( ) every second year ( ) every third year	( )

For Further Reference

From among the many publications in the field, the following have been selected for special notice. No one board member will be likely to read all, but each board member can benefit.

Many of the articles cited appeared in *AGB Reports*, a journal with which all trustees should be familiar. Back issues should be available in the library of AGB member institutions. Single copies of these articles can be obtained from the AGB Trustee Information Clearinghouse at a cost of $1.00 each for AGB members, $1.50 each for non-members.

Books bearing the designation [LL] are available to AGB members through the AGB Lending Library. They are mailed on request and may be kept for a period of two weeks.

*[LL]: Members may borrow copies through the AGB Lending Library.

A. Trusteeship in General

E. O. Bogue and R. O. Riggs, "Institutional Policy and Its Abuses," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 45, No. 5 (May 1974)

Howard R. Bowen, "Manpower Management and Higher Education," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (November/December 1973)

A noted economist and administrator presents cogent data and opinions on basic uses of higher education, warning against over-emphasis on vocational and professional education.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority Problems* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) [LL]*

John J. Corson, *The Governance of Colleges and Universities*, 2nd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975) [LL]

First published in 1969 and recently revised, long accepted as a standard work on academic administration, by an author who is both a trustee and a consultant in management.

Jorge I. Dominguez, "To Reign or To Rule: A Choice for University Boards of Trustees," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 15, No. 4 (January 1973)

A careful presentation of the need for more deliberation in the choice of the role to be played by a governing board.

Robert K. Greenleaf, "The Institution As Servant," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 14, No. 7 (April 1972)

A reminder that institutions should be careful to understand their role in society and to serve the role rather than to become self-justified and self-serving.

Louis H. Heilbron, *The College and University Trustee* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974) [LL]

A short but comprehensive treatise, aimed mainly at public boards, by an attorney who has served on a variety of boards, both public and private.

Harold L. Hodgkinson, *Campus Governance: The Amazing Thing Is That It Works At All*, Report 11 (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1971); excerpted as "Models in Campus Governance," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 14, No. 5 (February 1972)

Stanley O. Ikenberry, "The Organizational Dilemma," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 43, No. 1 (January 1972). Reprinted in *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 5 (February 1974)

An analysis of the conflicting needs for centralizing vs. decentralizing administration.

Asa S. Knowles, ed., *Handbook of College and University Administration*, Volume I, General (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970)

A two-volume encyclopedia of articles on all aspects of campus activity. Written for specialists, but useful for trustees as a convenient reference for particular topics.

John W. Nason, *The Future of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1975)

Report of the AGB Commission on the Future examines trusteeship under four main headings – The Current Academic Scene, Governance, Major Responsibilities of Trustees in the Years Ahead, and The Effective Board.

James Gilbert Paltridge, "Folklore and Some Facts About Trustee Decisions," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 6 (March 1974)

Summary of a study of 19 state-related boards, indicating need for reform in agenda for the board meeting, to insure better use of board function.

James A. Perkins, ed., *The University as an Organization* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) [LL]

Morton A. Rauh, *The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969) [LL]

A brief handbook, including case studies. Includes results of a survey of trustees conducted by the Educational Testing Service.

David A. Trivett, *Goals for Higher Education: Definitions and Directions*, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1973)

A concise summary of major concepts about the prime functions of higher education in America. Useful as a guide for trustees in debates over academic policy.

J. L. Zwingle and William V. Mayville, *College Trustees: A Question of Legitimacy*, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1974)

B. Private Colleges and Universities

Among the many treatments of the current situation in the private sector, one work stands out in importance for trustees. Based on intensive research among a variety of institutions, it was written by a long-time administrator, the chancellor of St. Louis University, Paul C. Reinert, S.J., under the title *To Turn the Tide* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972). The book's recommendations are summarized in "Reform or Perish," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (November/December 1972). Also:

Atherton Bean, "The Liberal Arts College Trustee's Next 25 Years," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*,

Vol. 17, No. 6 (May/June 1975)

Hugh Calkins, "A Plan for Survival," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

C. State-Related Universities

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. "Requiem or Renaissance for the New State College Trustee," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 7 (July/August 1975)

Leon J. Epstein, *Governing the University* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974) [LL]

R. W. Fleming, "Governing Boards in Major Public Institutions," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 9 (November/December 1975)

Lyman A. Glenny and Thomas K. Dalglish, *Public Universities, State Agencies, and the Law: Constitutional Autonomy in Decline* (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California/Berkeley, 1973)

D. Statewide Governing Boards and Multi-Campus Institutions

John J. Corson, "Institutional Governance Within a System," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 7 (April 1974)

Eugene C. Lee and Frank M. Bowen, *The Multicampus University: A Study of Academic Governance* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971) [LL]; excerpted in *AGB Reports*, Vol. 14, No. 5 (February 1972) and Vol. 14, No. 6 (March 1972)

A careful study of the problems of statewide governance, prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education

Allan W. Ostar, "State Leadership in Postsecondary Education," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (October 1973)

E. Coordinating Boards

All trustees and regents need urgently to study the issues surrounding statewide coordination of higher education. Regardless of the structure of coordination within a particular state, the issues are reasonably uniform and will affect the long-term future of education both public and private. The following sources will be found useful:

Robert Berdahl, *Evaluating Statewide Boards*, New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 5 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975)

Harold L. Enarson, "The Occasional Search for the Public Interest," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

Lyman A. Glenny, et al, *Coordinating Higher Education for the '70s* (Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California/Berkeley, 1971)

Lyman A. Glenny, "Statewide Planning and Local Autonomy," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (September 1973)

D. Kent Halstead, *Statewide Planning in Higher Education*

(Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1974) [LL]

A comprehensive resource book covering the large variety of topics involved in planning on the statewide level.

Task Force on Coordination, Governance and Structure of Post-secondary Education, *Coordination or Chaos?* (Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1973)

Larry Van Dyne, "The Statewide Board: Hope or Threat?" *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Logan Wilson, "External Governance in Higher Education: Bane or Boon?" An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

F. Community College

Joseph P. Cosand, "The Community College in a New Period of Change," An AGB Commission on the Future Essay, *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (September/October 1975)

Richard T. Ingram, "Trusteeship: An Overview," *Community and Junior College Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (October 1973)

Francis C. Pray, *A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975)

Richard Richardson, *Reforming College Governance*, New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 10 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975)

Richard C. Richardson, Jr., Clyde E. Blocker, and Louis W. Bender, *Governance for the Two-Year College* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972) [LL]

The Two-Year College Trustee: National Issues and Perspectives (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1972)

G. Presidential Search and Evaluation

For years there have been research and pronouncements on the importance of the presidential search and various recommendations on the correct way of organizing this crucial undertaking. A recent publication has summarized most of the experiences and varieties of opinion on the subject: Joseph F. Kauffman, *The Selection of College and University Presidents* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1974). It is recommended reading for all trustees when they have reason to seek a new chief executive.

Dr. Kauffman's book also contains references to the problem of presidential evaluation, and to the use of term appointments as one means of dealing with evaluation.

Several other sources will be useful:

Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*, A Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973) [LL]; excerpted as "The American College President," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (September 1974)

Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., "Evaluating a President," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

Manning M. Pattillo, "How to Choose a College President," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 15, No. 5 (February 1973)

Paul C. Reinert, S.J., "The Problem with Search Committees," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 7 (April 1974)

Nils Y. Wessell, "Board-President Relationships: Second Thoughts," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (January 1974)

Clifton R. Wharton, Jr., "The Stewardship of Trustees and the President," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (September 1973)

H. Academic Affairs

Commission on Academic Tenure in Higher Education, William R. Keast, chairman, *Faculty Tenure* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973) [LL]

W. Todd Furniss, "A Realistic Tenure Policy for the '70s," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 7 (July/August 1975)

William R. Keast, "Facing the Tenure Problem," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (November/December 1974)

Harold C. Martin, "Trustees and Academic Policy," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (October 1974)

F. Bruce Morgan, "Evaluating Teaching: Not Easy, Not Avoidable," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Sheila Tobias, "A Guide to Affirmative Action," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

I. Accountability

Stephen K. Bailey, "The Limits of Accountability," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 15, No. 8 (May/June 1973)

David D. Henry, "Accountability: To Whom, For What, By What Means," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 15, No. 5 (February 1973)

J. Collective Bargaining

The rapid spread of academic collective bargaining has created a new area in which trustee ignorance can be dangerous. Trustees should not become directly involved in the bargaining process, and should avail themselves of competent specialists, or make sure such specialists have been provided for the institution's negotiators. But to form policy guidelines and make competent judgment of the outcome, trustees need some background information on the subject.

Michael N. Bleicher, "A Substitute for the Strike," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 6 (May/June 1975)

Neil Bucklew, "Collective Bargaining: Three Campus Models," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

Robert C. Carr and Daniel K. Van Eyck, *Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973) [LL]

E. D. Duryea, Robert S. Fisk and Associates, *Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973) [LL]

Joseph Garbarino, *Faculty Bargaining: Change and Conflict*, Re-

port to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975) [LL]

Ray A. Howe, "Collective Bargaining: A Short Advanced Course," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (September/October 1975)

G. Gregory Lozier and Virginia Lee Lussier, "Collective Bargaining Rejected: Two Case Histories," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (September/October 1975)

George E. Potter, "Collective Bargaining: A Primer for College Trustees," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (September/October 1975)

John M. Lavine and Wallace L. Lemon, *Report of the Regents Task Force on University Governance and Collective Bargaining*, University of Wisconsin System (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1975)

K. Faculty and Student Participation in Governance

AGB Trustee Information Clearinghouse, "Faculty/Students on Boards," AGB Briefing Paper (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1974)

Barbara A. Blandford, "Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards," Higher Education Panel Survey No. 11 (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972)

Leonard DeFiore, "Trustee-Faculty Conflicts," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 14, No. 7 (April 1972)

Harold C. Martin, "Pathologies of Participation," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 8 (May/June 1974)

Office of Youth and Student Affairs, *On the Nature and Scope of Student Participation on Boards of Trustees* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1973)

Bruce J. Partridge, "University Governance," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 14, No. 6 (March 1972)

Daniel H. Perlman, "Faculty Trusteeship," *Educational Record*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (Spring 1973)

L. Resource Management

Howard R. Bowen and Stephen K. Bailey, *The Effective Use of Resources: Financial and Human* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1974)

Edwin M. Crawford, "Improving Your Public Appropriations," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

R. L. Ellis, "Managing the Endowment," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 5 (March/April 1975)

Arthur C. Frantzreb, "Trustee Responsibility for Procurement of Resources," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (November/December 1974)

Franklyn A. Johnson and John A. Yngve, "Fiscal Policies: Procurement and Management of Resources," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 4 (January 1974)

George N. Rainsford, "Two Plus Two Equals Five," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 7 (July/August 1975)

G. T. Smith, "Getting More from Private Givers," *AGB Reports*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (January/February 1975)

M. Trustee Liability

Recent court rulings have made it clear that there are many circumstances in which trustees and regents can become vulnerable to lawsuits by students, faculty and others. Imprudent management, conflict of interest, denial of due process and violations of professional rights are some of the potential bases for trustee liability. As yet, the amount of useful literature is scant. It includes the following:

AGB Trustee Information Clearinghouse, "Trustee Liability," AGB Briefing Paper (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1974)

Ray J. Aiken, "Tort Liability of Governing Boards, Administrators and Faculty in Higher Education," *Journal of College and University Law*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Winter 1974-75)

Ray J. Aiken, principal investigator, and John F. Adams, associate investigator, *Report of the AAC Project on Liability of College and University Trustees, Presidents and Other Officers* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, forthcoming – January 1, 1976)

William C. Porth, "Personal Liability of Trustees of Educational Institutions," *Journal of College and University Law*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Winter 1973-74); excerpted in *AGB Reports*, Vol. 16, No. 9 (July/August 1974)

William C. Porth, "Personal Liability of Trustees of Higher Educational Institutions," *Journal of College and University Law*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (Winter 1974-75)